

## REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3-24 are currently pending in the application. Claims 12 and 13 are hereby cancelled.

Claims 1, 5, 21, 22 and 24 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,882,517, to Chen et al (Chen). Claims 1, 3-11 and 14-24 stand rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over Japanese Unexamined Patent Application Publication No. 10-85729 (Japan '729) in view of Chen.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 3-11 and 14-24 is requested.

Applicant's undersigned attorney wishes to thank Examiner Cintins for the courtesies extended him at the interview on July 17, 2003.

During the interview, comments made by the Examiner in the Advisory Action dated April 30, 2003 were discussed. The Examiner states in that Advisory Action that the Declaration of Mr. Urabe, filed in conjunction with the April 3, 2003 Response herein, does not support the patentability of the broad claims. More specifically, it was noted that the Declaration relates to test data including structural limitations which are not recited in the broadest claims.

By incorporating the limitations of claims 12 and 13, it is believed that the unexpected results described in Mr. Urabe's Declaration correspond with the claimed structure.

The Examiner further comments in the Advisory Action that U.S. Patent No. 4,753,728, to Vanderbilt et al (Vanderbilt), teaches use of a melt index polymer as a binder to account for higher flow rates. The Examiner further states that use of the lower region of the broad range described by Chen would be suggested by Vanderbilt.

As applicant noted during the interview, the excellent results achieved through the claimed structure are attributable to a combination of the nature of both the particulate material as well as the binder. For one specific binder selection, flow characteristics will change depending upon the nature of the particulate material. The combination of elements in the specific structure, as now claimed, accounts for the unexpectedly good operating characteristics.

In light of the amendment to claim 1, claim 1 is believed allowable. Claims 3-11 and 14-24 depend cognately from claim 1 and recite further significant structural detail to further distinguish over the cited art.

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 1, 3-11 and 14-24 and allowance of the case are requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "J. S. Mortimer", is written over a horizontal line.

John S. Mortimer, Reg. No. 30,407

WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ,  
CLARK & MORTIMER  
500 W. Madison St., Suite 3800  
Chicago, IL 60661  
(312) 876-1800

Date: August 5, 2003